

REMARKS

Claims 3-10 and 12-38 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 6, 8, 12 and 13 are amended. Claims 1, 2 and 11 are canceled. New claims 15-38 have been added.

Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Phan for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative Wesley Jones during the interview of April 18, 2006. A summary of the substance of the interview is set forth below.

During the interview, Applicants' representative asserted that the applied § 103 references did not disclose or suggest "at least one voltage wire which is routed between the engine and a passenger cabin," as recited in independent claims 15, 16 and 17. The Examiner indicated that it appeared that new claims 15, 16 and 17 distinguish over Kobayashi et al. and Hirano but refrained from definitively concluding as much.

Applicants' representative also asserted that the applied § 102 reference did not teach or disclose all of the features of independent claims 15, 16 and 17 for the reasons provided below. The Examiner indicated that he would consider arguments directed to the § 102 rejection on receipt of a written Response.

§ 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Hirano (USP 6,460,642) in view of Kobayashi et al. (USP 6,856,057). This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot regarding canceled claims 1, 2 and 11 and claims 3-10 and 12-14 which now depend from new claim 15.

Kobayashi et al. discloses a high voltage wire disposed adjacent to an engine, but fails to disclose or suggest an at least one high voltage wire routed between an engine and a passenger cabin as claimed in independent claims 15, 16 and 17. The Office Action admits that Hirano fails to teach or suggest this feature. Further, neither Hirano nor Kobayashi et al., either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of newly present independent claims 15, 16 and 17.

Further, neither reference teaches or suggests that the at least one high voltage wire is routed between the engine and a passenger cabin and that the high voltage wires are bundled together and the high voltage wires are secured to a securing unit at the position where the high voltage wires are bundled together, as recited in claim 15.

For at least these reasons, claims 15, 16 and 17 are allowable over the cited art. Further, it is submitted that all claims dependent therefrom would not be rejected based on Hirano and Kobayashi et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly requested.

§ 102 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 USC § 103(e) over Pacheco, Sr. (USP 5,689,174). This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot regarding canceled claims 1, 2 and 11 and claims 3-10 and 12-14 which now depend from new claim 15.

The Office Action states that Pacheco, Sr. discloses an inverter (8) disposed in an engine room. However, according to Pacheco, Sr., reference element (8) is an alternator (see col. 2, line 24). Moreover, Fig. 3 of Pacheco, Sr. does not teach or disclose a high voltage wire secured to a securing unit but instead only shows that the high voltage wire connects the alternator (8) and a battery (13).

For at least these reasons, claims 15, 16 and 17 are allowable over the cited art. Further, it is submitted that all claims dependent therefrom would not be rejected based on Pacheco, Sr. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly requested.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance.
Prompt consideration and allowance are solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any
information concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or
§ 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2006



Wesley W. Jones
Registration No. 56,552

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201

606377_1.doc